

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 and 32-34 are pending in the present application. In an Office Action mailed January 3, 2007 (hereinafter "Office Action"), Claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, and 32-34 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,128,016, issued to Coelho et al. (hereinafter "Coelho et al.") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,896,491, issued to Englefield (hereinafter "Englefield"). Claim 6 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coelho et al., Englefield, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,020,697, issued to Goodman et al. (hereinafter "Goodman et al."). Claims 8 and 12-19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coelho et al., Englefield, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,815,152, issued to Collier et al. (hereinafter "Collier et al.").

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, and 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Coelho et al. in view of Englefield. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coelho et al., Englefield, and in further view of Goodman et al.. Claims 8 and 12-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coelho et al., Englefield, and in further view of Collier et al..

For the following reasons, applicants respectfully submit that the rejected Claims of the present application are not rendered obvious over Coelho et al., Englefield, Goodman et al., and Collier et al. because the cited and applied references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the independent Claim 1 limitations: "obtaining one or more actions to be executed on one or more counters related to specific functions of one or more networked computing devices", "displaying a set of graphical action icons for selection by a user, wherein each action icon representing a control to the one or more actions to be executed on the one or more counters of the one or more computing devices", and "instructing the one or more actions controlled by the selected graphical action icon to execute on the one or more counters of each

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

controlled by the selected graphical action icon to execute on the one or more counters of each networked computing device controlled by the selected graphical computing device icon." The aforementioned cited and applied references, either alone or in combination, further fail to teach or suggest similar limitations recited in independent Claim 32. Prior to discussing more detailed reasons why applicants believe that all of the Claims of the present application are allowable over the cited references, a brief description of the present invention and the cited references is presented.

Summary of the Present Invention

The present application is generally related to a system and method for controlling a number of computing devices, such as servers, from a central control computer by manipulating a common graphical user interface ("GUI"). More particularly, the GUI generates a set of graphical icons representative of a group of computing devices within a network that will be managed, and a set of graphical action icons representative of computing device actions captured by control parameters, that are to be executed by selected computing devices. A user of the GUI may select a computing device icon and/or an action icon and thereby implement the actions represented by the selected action icon on each of the computing devices represented by the selected computing device icon.

In one example of the present invention, a user may select several server icons (representing a group of servers) and an action icon that represents actions relating to the collection of performance monitoring data for the selected servers. Upon selection of the action icons for selected servers, those actions are automatically executed on each of the selected servers. In particular, the server control computer, upon receipt of a selection of servers and actions, generates and issues a template to each of the selected servers containing information to initiate the selected actions. Thus, the present invention provides the ability to control several networked computing devices, located at geographically distinct sites, by instructing to execute instructions from a common location on each server.

Coelho et al. is purportedly directed toward a graphical user interface ("GUI") for monitoring and displaying information pertaining to the components and subcomponents of a single server. (See Coelho et al., Col. 13, lines 11-17; Col. 16, lines 17-21; Figure 3.) The component categories and associated subcomponent categories are displayed as icons within a hierarchical navigation model. (Col. 8, lines 34-42; Figure 3, Levels 1 and 2.) A user may traverse through the component and subcomponent areas of a single server by selecting the displayed category icons. (Col. 8, lines 35-39; Figure 3.) Coelho et al. teaches that selecting an icon triggers the navigation model to display either a next level of the selected component category or a dialog screen containing information. (Col. 8, lines 40-42; Figure 3.)

As presented in Coelho et al., the user may determine the status in addition to setting threshold values for items to be managed within the server. (Abstract.) The user monitors and updates the server with the latest values by clicking on a control button on a display screen. (Col. 10, lines 63-65; Col. 11, lines 19-21; Col. 11, lines 31-33.) Once an update value is added in, the workstation connects to a server system through a communications network. The workstation framework facility converts requests for reading and writing data from the application into the appropriate management application protocols within the TCP/IP protocol suite for communicating with the server. (Col. 3, lines 51-58. Figures 4b, 4c, and 4d.)

Coelho et al. fails to teach or suggest obtaining one or more actions to be executed on one or more counters related to specific functions of one or more networked computing devices, and displaying a set of graphical action icons for selection by a user, wherein each action icon representing a control to the one or more actions to be executed on the one or more counters of the one or more computing devices. Moreover, Coelho et al. fails to teach or suggest instructing the one or more actions controlled by the selected graphical action icon to execute on the one or more counters of each networked computing device controlled by the selected graphical computing device icon.

U.S. Patent No. 5,896,491 (Englefield)

Englefield is purportedly directed toward a system and method for processing data represented on a display device. (Col. 1, lines 6-9.) Englefield teaches an icon display for representing each processing operation available to the user. (Col. 2, lines 25-27.) The processing operations are generally divided into two distinct types, i.e., interpretation operations and data generation operations. (Col. 1, line 26-Col. 2, line 5.) The user selects one of the processing operation icons. (Col. 5, line 67-Col. 6, line 2.) The user then moves a pointer to apply the processing operations to a list of data items on the graphical interface. (Col. 7, line 21-Col. 8, line 8.) These data items are illustrated in Figures 3A-5E as a list of numerical values in a file.

Nevertheless, Englefield fails to teach or suggest obtaining one or more actions to be executed on one or more counters related to specific functions of one or more networked computing devices. Englefield also fails to teach or suggest graphical computing device icons which represent a control of one or more computing devices in a network. Accordingly, Englefield fails to teach or suggest obtaining a selection of the one or more computing devices controlled by a graphical computing device icon. Further, Englefield fails to teach or suggest instructing the one or more actions controlled by the selected graphical action icon to execute on the one or more counters of each networked computing device controlled by the selected graphical computing device icon.

The Claims Distinguished

Rejection of Claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, and 32-34 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent Claims 1, 12, and 32

For purposes of this discussion, Claims 1, 12, and 32 will be discussed together because the limitations discussed herein are similar for each claim. Claim 1 reads as follows:

1. A method of providing a computing device control interface for centrally controlling a plurality of networked computing devices, the method comprising:

obtaining one or more actions to be executed on one or more counters related to specific functions of one or more networked computing devices;

displaying a set of graphical action icons for selection by a user, wherein each action icon representing a control to the one or more actions to be executed on the one or more counters of the one or more computing devices;

displaying a set of graphical computing device icons wherein each graphical computing device icon represents a control to the one or more networked computing devices;

obtaining a selection of initializing the one or more actions controlled by a graphical action icon;

obtaining a selection of initializing the one or more networked computing devices controlled by a graphical computing device icon; and

instructing the one or more actions controlled by the selected graphical action icon to execute on the one or more counters of each networked computing device controlled by the selected graphical computing device icon.

Similarly, Claim 12 reads as follows:

12. In a computer system having a display and at least one graphical user interface selection device, a method of providing a centralized server control interface for executing a group of actions concurrently on a group of networked computing devices, the method comprising:

obtaining an identification of a group of actions to be executed by on counters related to specific functions of a group of networked computing devices;

displaying the group of actions as an action icon on the display;

obtaining an identification of a group of networked computing devices on which to execute the group of actions;

displaying the group of networked computing devices as a computing device icon on the display;

obtaining a selection of the action icon by the graphical user interface selection device; and

instructing the group of actions displayed as the selected action icon to execute on the group of networked computing devices displayed as the computing device icon upon manipulating the selected action icon to overlap on the computing device icon.

Claim 32 reads as follows:

32. A method of providing a server control interface for centrally controlling a plurality of networked servers, the method comprising:

obtaining one or more actions to be executed on one or more counters related to specific functions of one or more networked servers;
displaying a set of graphical action icons for selection by a user, wherein each action icon representing a control to the one or more actions to be executed by one or more networked servers, and wherein at least one graphical action icon in the set of graphical action icons includes an action to implement a collection template for capacity planning;
displaying a set of graphical server icons wherein each graphical server icon represents a control to the one or more networked servers;
obtaining a selection of initializing the one or more actions controlled by a graphical action icon;
obtaining a selection of initializing the one or more networked servers controlled by a graphical server icon; and
instructing the one or more actions controlled by the selected graphical action icon to execute on the one or more counters of each networked server controlled by the selected graphical server icon.

The Office Action asserts that Coelho et al. in combination with Englefield teaches each of the elements of Claims 1, 12, and 32. Applicants respectfully disagree. In contrast to the claims of the present application, Coelho et al. is directed toward a graphical user interface ("GUI") for monitoring and displaying information pertaining to the components and subcomponents of a server. (See Coelho et al., Col. 13, lines 11-17; Col. 16, lines 17-21; Figure 3.) Coelho et al. teaches that the user may update the threshold values that are used to manage the server. (Col. 10, lines 63-65.) After entering in updating values, the workstation connects to the server. A workstation application converts requests for reading and writing into protocols for communicating with the server. (Col. 3, lines 51-58; Col. 11, lines 19-21; Col. 11, lines 31-33; Figures 4b, 4c, and 4d.)

Englefield is directed toward a system and method for processing data represented on a display device. (Col. 1, lines 6-9.) Englefield teaches an icon display means for representing each processing operation available to the user as an icon on the display device. (Col. 2, lines 25-27.) The processing operations are generally divided into two distinct types, i.e., interpretation operations and data generation operations. (Col. 1, line 26-Col. 2, line 5.) The user selects one of the processing operation icons. (Col. 5, line 67-Col. 6, line 2.) The user then moves a pointer to apply the processing operation to a list of data items on the graphical

interface. (Col. 7, line 21-Col. 8, line 8.) These data items are illustrated in Figures 3A-5E as a list of numerical values in a file.

Applicants submit that Coelho et al. in combination with Englefield does not teach or suggest obtaining one or more actions to be executed on one or more counters related to specific functions of one or more networked computing devices and instructing the one or more actions controlled by the selected graphical action icon to execute on the one or more counters of each networked computing device controlled by the selected graphical computing device icon as recited in Claims 1, 12, and 32.

Applicants agree with the Office Action that Coelho et al. fails to teach displaying a set of graphical action icons for selection by a user in which each action icon representing a control to the one or more actions to be executed on the one or more counters of the one or more computing devices. Coelho et al. does not teach the creation of an icon corresponding to a number of actions to be executed on one or more counters (action icon) and another component is capable of creating another icon corresponding to a number of servers that will concurrently execute the actions (computing device icon). Additionally, Englefield, like Coelho et al., fails to teach obtaining one or more actions to be executed on one or more counters related to specific functions of one or more networked computing devices. Englefield does not teach displaying a set of graphical computing device icons such that each graphical computing device icon represents a control to the one or more networked computing devices.

Further, as taught in Coelho et al., threshold values for a server are updated through a GUI interface. (Col. 10, lines 63-65.) The data values are either read or written from the server through a protocol. Because requests for reading and writing data are converted into protocols, Coelho et al. fails to teach or suggest instructing the one or more actions controlled by the selected graphical action icon to execute on the one or more counters of each networked computing device controlled by the selected graphical computing device icon. As taught in Englefield, the user selects a processing operation and applies the processing operation to data

items directly on the display device. (Col. 1, lines 6-9; Col. 2, lines 25-27; Col. 5, line 67-Col. 6, line 2; Col. 7, line 21-Col. 8, line 8.) The processing operation accesses information within local memory and changes the data within the memory location on the computer system. (Col. 8, lines 4-17; Figure 1.) Thus, Englefield fails to teach or suggest instructing the one or more actions controlled by the selected graphical action icon to execute on the one or more counters of each networked computing device controlled by the selected graphical computing device icon.

Generally described, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), a *prima facie* case of obviousness can be established only if the cited references, alone or in combination, teach each and every element recited in the claim. *In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Coelho et al. and Englefield, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest obtaining one or more actions to be executed on one or more counters related to specific functions of one or more networked computing devices and instructing the one or more actions controlled by the selected graphical action icon to execute on the one or more counters of each networked computing device controlled by the selected graphical computing device icon. For the above reasons, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claims 1, 12, and 32 and assert that Claims 1, 12, and 32 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Coelho et al. and Englefield.

Dependent Claims 2-11

Claims 2-11 depend from Claim 1. As discussed above, Coelho et al. and Englefield fail to teach or suggest each of the limitations recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, for the above-mentioned reasons, Claims 2-11 are likewise allowable over the cited art. In addition, Claims 2-11 further add to the patentability and nonobviousness of the claims. For these reasons, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections of Claims 2-11 and allowance of the claims.

Dependent Claims 13-19

Claims 13-19 depend from Claim 12. Applicants have withdrawn Claim 13. Further, as discussed above, Coelho et al. and Englefield fail to teach or suggest each of the limitations

recited in Claim 12. Accordingly, for the above-mentioned reasons, Claims 14-19 are likewise allowable over the cited art. In addition, Claims 14-19 further add to the nonobviousness of the claims. For these reasons, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections of Claims 14-19 and allowance of the claims.

Dependent Claims 33-34

Claims 33-34 are dependent on Claim 32. As discussed above, Coelho et al. and Englefield fail to teach or suggest each of the limitations recited in Claim 32. Accordingly, for the above-mentioned reasons, Claims 33-34 are likewise allowable over the cited art. In addition, Claims 33-34 further add to the patentability of the claims. For these reasons, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections of Claims 33-34 and allowance of the claims.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above-referenced arguments, applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending Claims of the present application, Claims 1-12, 14-19, and 32-34, are allowable over the cited and applied references. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all the rejections of the Claims of the present invention and allowance of the present application. If any questions remain, applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}

 for
Reg. 44,328

Mauricio A. Uribe
Registration No. 46,206
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1728